

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 12, 13, 17, 20, 22, 24, 27, 49 and 50 are pending. Claim 49 has been amended.

The amendment filed 7/20/2005 has been objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. Applicants traverse this objection.

The Office Action stated that 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. Applicants assert that no new matter is involved.

The Office Action stated that the added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: In one version of the invention there can be no other layer in contact with the plastic film during the cutting of the at least one line of perfection. Applicants traverse this statement. See page 3, lines 26 to 29, page 2, lines 14 to 16 and the Abstract, last two lines. Figure 1 also shows that the step is inherent therein.

The Office Action stated that applicants are required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action. Applicants traverse this statement.

This objection should be withdrawn.

The Office Action stated that the 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, of Claims 12 to 17, 20 to 24 and 27 has been repeated as previously made in the Office Action dated 3/23/2005. This rejection is still in error and unsupportable.

The 3/23/2005 Office Action stated that the claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to

reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Applicants traverse this statement. The Examiner based this rejection only on the first paragraph of Section 112, and quoted that part of the patent statute on page 2 of the 3/23/2005 Office Action as follows:

“The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is mostly nearly connected, to make and use the same....”

Nowhere does the first paragraph of Section 112 say “in such a way as to reasonably convey” or “the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention”. The Examiner’s statement is not even related to the requirement of the first paragraph of Section 112. The Examiner’s statement basically asserts that the specification does not reasonably convey to one skilled in that the applicant possessed the invention at the time the application was filed. That has nothing to do with Section 112, first paragraph, that which is required by the first paragraph of Section 112 is that the written description enables on skilled in the art to make and use the invention. The Examiner has not used the requirements of the first paragraphs of Section 112 so this rejection is defective on its facts.

The Examiner has not factually shown, or even alleged, in the record that applicants’ specification does not have a written description that is in such full,

clear, concise and exact terms as to enable one skilled in the art to make and use the invention. This fact alone shows that this rejection is defective and should be withdrawn (at least until the requirements of Section 112, first paragraph, are alleged and factually established in the record).

Furthermore, using the Examiner's standard that is not found in the patent statute, the Examiner has not factually established in the record that applicants' specification does not reasonably convey (at the time the application was filed) that the applicants possessed the invention. The Examiner has not carried his burden of proof.

The 3/23/2005 Office Action stated that the new matter is "there being no other layer in contact with the plastic film during the cutting of the at least one line of perforations". Applicants traverse this statement. Figure 1 shows no layer on the lower side of the layer 14. Also Figure 1 shows adhesive layer 16 directly on the upper side of layer 14 with no other layer between adhesive layer 16 and layer 14. Perforation 18 in layer 14 does not extend into adhesive layer 16. This factually shows that adhesive layer 16 (and no other layer) was on the side of layer 14 when perforations 18 were cut in layer 14. Page 2, lines 29 and 30, of the specification states:

"The cutting may take place before or after coating the film with an adhesive layer." [Emphasis supplied]

See also original Claims 3 and 4. Page 3, line 26 to 30, of the specification, in describing the production of the packaging film of Figure 1 states:

“The production of the packaging film shown in figure 1 is such that first the inner layer 14 is available in strip form and lines of perforations 18 are cut into it using a cutting device. The pre-cut inner layer 14 is then joined to the outer layer 12 to make the packaging film 10. Thereby, the layer of adhesive 16 may if desired already be presented on the inner layer 14 before the cutting is performed.” [Emphasis supplied]

Page 3, lines 20 to 24, states:

“A packaging film 10 shown in figure 1 has an outer layer 12 of e.g. polyethyleneterephthalate (PET) and a layer 14 e.g. of polyethylene (PE) which later in the packaging faces the contents. The inner layer 14 is bonded to the outer layer 12 e.g. via an adhesive layer 16 e.g. of polyurethane (PU) basis. In an alternative version the inner layer 14 is joined to the outer layer 12 by extrusion.”

The above information shows the process claim phrase “there being no other in contact with the plastic film during the cutting of at least one line of perforations” is not new matter and is fully supported by the disclosure in the specification including the original claims, and in the drawings.

The initial burden of proof is upon the Examiner to factually establish that the subject process claim phrase is new matter, and he has not carried his burden of proof. The mere assertion that new matter is involved is insufficient. Applicants have factually shown that the subject process claim phrase is not new matter. The initial burden of proof is also upon the Examiner to factually establish that the subject process claim phrase is not disclosed in the

specification, and he has not carried his burden of proof. His mere assertion is insufficient. Applicants have factually shown that the subject process claim phrase is factually disclosed and supported in the specification.

The specification has been amended to insert the factually disclosed and supported subject process claim phrase in its exact language into the specification on page 2, line 34. Since the applicants' have shown that this rejection is incorrect, entry of the subject process claim phrase into the specification is requested.

The 3/23/2005 Office Action stated that the specification does not disclose that there is no other layer in contact with the plastic film during the cutting of the at least one line of the perforations. Applicants traverse this statement and have factually shown above that it is incorrect.

The 3/23/2005 Office Action stated that applicants simply amended the claims to cover the prior art of Olivieri et al. This statement is meaningless under the patent law. The subject process claim phrase (limitation) is fully disclosed and supported by the specification (and the original claims and drawings). The specification includes the original claims 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and 37 C.F.R. 1.75(a).

This rejection should be withdrawn.

The Office Acton stated that the following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear,

concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 12 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants traverse this rejection.

The Office Action stated that the claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicants traverse this rejection.

The Office Action stated that the new matter issue is “at least two lines.” No new matter is involved.

The Office Action stated that applicants have support for “at least one line” or “two lines” but not “at least two lines.” Applicants traverse this statement as the specification now recites “at least two lines” and the disclosure supports such recitation. The phrase “at least one line” includes “one line” and “two lines”, hence applicants can give up “one line” so that the phrase becomes “at least two lines” and is supported, and is not new matter. The Examiner has not carried his burden of proof that new matter is involved – assertions are not the necessary facts to support his position.

This rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 27 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants traverse this rejection.

The Office Action stated that the claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicants traverse this statement.

The Office Action stated that the new matter issue is “dividing the multi-layer packaging film into at least two parts,” and “a notch in the opposite edge of at least another part of the multilayer packaging film”. Applicants traverse this statement. Applicants’ application states:

“A type of packaging in the form of a pouch 20 shown in figure 2 is comprised essentially of two packaging films 10 which are superimposed on each other and are joined at the edge forming a sealing seam 22 which runs around the whole pouch 20.”

[Page 3, lines 32 to 35]

“Fig. 2 the plan view of a pouch manufactured from the packaging film shown in figure 1.”

[Page 3, lines 17 and 18]

As the prior art shows, applicants’ application states:

“In a pouch-type form of packaging made from the packaging film, and featuring to packaging films that are joined together forming a sealing

seam at an edge running round the packaging, a tearing notch is provided at the edge of the pouch....”

[Page 1, lines 18 to 21]

Applicants’ application states:

“7. Process according to one of the claims 1 to 6, characterised in that the packaging film is employed for the production of pouch-type forms of packaging.”

[Original Claim 7, lines 1 and 2]

“The process according to the invention for manufacturing generally known multi-layer packaging films with integral aid to tearing in the form of lines of perforations for a tear propagating in the packaging film on tearing open the packaging....”

[Page 4, lines 8 to 11]

The claims are part of the specification as per 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

The Examiner has not factually proven that new matter is involved.

Figure 2 confirms applicants’ statement of the disclosure in the application.

The Office Action stated that, also, “each at least one line of perforations and the notch of each of the one part with the another part are aligned with each other” is new matter. Applicants traverse this statement. The Examiner has not factually proven that this is new matter. See page 3, lines 6 to 9, page 3, line 33, to page 4, line 4, and original Claims 6, 7 and 10. No new matter is involved.

This rejection should be withdrawn.

The M.P.E.P. 2163.04, (Rev. 3), states:

“2163.04 Burden on the Examiner with Regard to the Written Description Requirement”

“The inquiry into whether the description requirement is met must be determined on a case-by-case basis and is a question of fact. *In re Werthelm*, 541 F.2d 257, 262, 191 USPQ 90, 96 (CCPA 1976). A description as filed is presumed to be adequate, unless or until sufficient evidence or reasoning to the contrary has been presented by the examiner to rebut the presumption. See, e.g., *In re Marzocchi*, 439 F. 2d 220, 224, 169 USPQ 367, 370 (CCPA 1971). The examiner, therefore, must have a reasonable basis to challenge the adequacy of the written description. The examiner has the initial burden of presenting by a preponderance of evidence why a person skilled in the art would not recognize in an applicant’s disclosure a description of the invention defined by the claims. *Werthelm*, 541 F.2d at 263, 191 USPQ at 97.”

“I. STATEMENT OF REJECTION REQUIREMENTS”

“In rejecting the claim, the examiner must set forth express findings of fact which support the lack of written description conclusion (see MPEP § 2163 for examination guidelines pertaining to the written description requirement). These findings should:

A. Identify the claim limitation at issue; and

B. Establish a *prima facie* case by providing reasons why a person skilled in the art at the time the application was filed would not have

recognized that the inventor was in possession of the invention as claimed in view of the disclosure of the application as filed.”

Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants traverse this rejection.

The Office Action stated: that the claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicants disagree and point out a mere assertion by the Examiner is not factual proof.

The Office Action stated that the new matter issue is “dividing the multi-layer packaging film into at least two parts,” and “a notch in the opposite edge of at least another part of the multilayer packaging film”. The Examiner has not factually proven this.

The Office Action stated that, also, “each at least one line of perforations and the notch of each of the one part with the another part are aligned with each other” is new matter. The Examiner has not factually proven this.

The Office Action stated that, furthermore, “the plastic film having at least one line of perforations of the one part and the another part of the pouch is situated on the inner side of the pouch” is new matter. The Examiner has not factually proven this.

The Examiner has the burden of proving that new matter is involved.

This rejection has been withdrawn.

The Office Action stated that the following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office Action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Before treating the specifics of the two obviousness rejections below, applicants show why both obviousness rejections are in error and should be withdrawn.

Besides the errors in and unsustainability of the two obviousness rejections, as shown below the two obviousness rejections are defective on their face and for failure to follow Patent Office policy and the requirements of the Supreme Court's Graham decision [i.e., 383 U.S.1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966)].

Section 2141 of the M.P.E.P. (Rev. 2) states:

"Office policy is to follow *Graham v. John Deere Co.* in the consideration and determination of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103. As quoted above, the four factual inquiries enunciated therein as a background for determining obviousness are as follows:

(A) Determining the scope and contents of the prior art;

(B) Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims in issue;

(C) Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art;
and

(D) Evaluating evidence of secondary considerations.”

[Emphasis Supplied]

Nowhere has the Examiner factually determined in the record the level of ordinary skill in the art. Accordingly, the Examiner has not made a valid obviousness rejection or a valid factual showing of prima facie obviousness.

The Board of Appeal's (nonprecedential) decision of *Ex parte Leu et al.* states:

“Rejections based on § 103(a) must rest on a factual basis with these facts being interpreted without hindsight reconstruction of the invention from the prior art. See *In re Warner*, 379 F.2d 1011, 1017, 154 USPQ 173, 177 (CCPA 1967). Our reviewing court has repeatedly cautioned against employing hindsight by using the Appellants' disclosure as a blueprint to reconstruct the claimed invention from the isolated teachings of the prior art. See, e.g., *Grain Processing Corp. v. American Maize-Productions Co.*, 840 F.2d 902, 907, 5 USPQ2d 1788, 1792 (Fed. Cir. 1988),”
[Emphasis supplied] [Page 7, lines 9 to 15].

Section 2141.03 of the M.P.E.P. (Rev. 2) states:

“The importance of resolving the level of ordinary skill in the art lies in the necessity of maintaining objectivity in the obviousness

inquiry.’ *Ryko Mfg. Co. v. Nu-Star, Inc.*, 950 F.2d 714, 718, 21 USPQ2d 1053, 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1991). The examiner must ascertain what would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, and not to the inventor, a judge, a layman, those skilled in remote arts, or to geniuses in the art at hand. *Environmental Designs, Ltd. v. Union Oil Co.*, 713 F.2d 693, 218 USPQ 865 (Fed. Cir. 1983), *cert. denied*, 464 U.S. 1043 (1984).”

Since the Examiner has not factually determined in the record the level of ordinary skill in the art, there cannot be a *prima facie* showing of obviousness. The burden of proof is still on the Examiner. Section 2144.08, II, of the M.P.E.P. states:

“A proper obviousness analysis involves a three-step process. First, Office personnel should establish a *prima facie* case of unpatentability considering the factors set out by the Supreme Court in *Graham v. John Deere*. See, e.g., *In re Bell*, 991 F.2d 781, 783 26 USPQ2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1993) (‘The PTO bears the burden of establishing a case of *prima facie* obviousness.’); *In re Rijckaert*, 9 F.3d 1531, 1532, 28 USPQ2d 1955, 1956 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 USPQ2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992). *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1; 17-18 (1966), requires that to make out a case of obviousness, one must:

- (A) determine the scope and contents of the prior art;
- (B) ascertain the differences between the prior art and the claims in issue;
- (C) determine the level of skill in the pertinent art; and
- (D) evaluate any evidence of secondary considerations. If a *prima facie* case is established, the burden shifts to applicant to come forward with rebuttal evidence or argument to overcome the *prima facie* case.” [Emphasis Supplied]

The Board of Appeal’s (nonprecedential) decision of *Ex parte Yim et al.*, (Appeal No. 2005-2013), states:

“To hold an invention obvious in view of a combination of references, there must be some suggestion, motivation, or teaching in the prior art that would have led a person of ordinary skill in the art to select the reference teachings and combine them in a way that would produce the claimed invention.” [Page 3, lines 16 to 19]

The Examiner has not factually determined in the record the ordinary level of skill in the art so the Examiner does not know who is, or anything about, one ordinarily skilled in the art. Accordingly, even where one ordinarily skilled in the art is asserted by the Examiner to have motivation, the Examiner’s position is clearly defective because the Examiner does not know anything about one ordinarily skilled in art. The Examiner has not factually established in the record any *prima facie* showing of obviousness of appellants’ claimed invention.

The two obvious rejections fail.

Claims 12, 13, 17, 24, 27, 49 and 50 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Niwa (European Published Patent Application 0468619) in view of Olivieri et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,427,420). Applicants traverse this rejection as being mere speculation and forbidden hindsight.

The Office Action stated that Niwa discloses a process for preparing a multilayer packaging (col. 1, lines 1 to 3), comprising cutting at least one line of perforations completely through a plastic film consisting of a single plastic film (col. 3, lines 15 to 20), that is to be a precut, surface plastic layer of the multilayer packaging film (Figure 1, number 4), there being no other layer in contact with the plastic film during the cutting of the at least one line of perforations (Col. 3, lines 15 to 25), each of the at least one line of perforations extending from edge to edge of the plastic film (Figure 3, number 7), and joining the precut plastic layer with at least one other layer to form the multilayer packaging film (col. 3 lines 22 to 25), and providing a notch in one edge of the multilayer packing film in the region of the perforations for initiating tearing along the tear line (col. 3, lines 35 to 48), the at least one line of perforations serve as an aid for alignment of the tear line propagating in the multilayer packaging film upon tearing open the packaging (col. 3, lines 44 to 48), and the packaging being easy to open by means of the tear line and the notch (col. 3, lines 35 to 38). This statement is partially incorrect.

The Office Action stated that Niwa discloses that the precut plastic layer is joined to the last one other layer by means of an adhesive layer to make up the multilayer film (col.3, lines 22 to 25). This does not cause obviousness.

The Office Action stated that Niwa discloses that wherein two lines of perforations are cut parallel or substantially parallel to each other at a distance apart as guidelines on both sides of a tear which propagates in the packaging film on tearing open (col.3, line 50). This does not cause obviousness.

The Office Action stated that Niwa discloses wherein the packaging film is employed for the production of pouch forms of packaging by sealing edges of the one part with the edges of another part that is positioned so that the each at least one line of perforations and the notch of each of the one part with the another part are aligned with each other (col. 3, lines 31 to 34). This does not cause obviousness.

The Office Action stated that Niwa fails to disclose that the notch is situated between the two lines of perforations. Niwa also directs one ordinarily skilled in the art away from locating a notch between two lines of perforations.

Niwa states:

“The easily openable pouch produced by the above described laminated film is shown in Fig. 3. The easily openable pouch 8 includes multi-layer films containing the above described laminated film. In this case, a notch 10 (triangular notch 10 is shown in the illustrated embodiment is formed at a side heat seal portion 9 of the easily openable pouch 8. A tip portion of the notch 10 is aligned with the slit 7.

Alternatively, the notch 10 is positioned slightly lower than the slit 7 as shown in Fig. 3 for facilitating the opening of the pouch. That is, when opening the pouch, a user grips the upper marginal portion of the resultant pouch, and pulls the upper marginal portion upwardly. Therefore, the upward tearing can easily reach the slit portion 7 positioned immediately above the tip end portion of the notch 10, and thereafter, the tearing can be made along the slit ‘.’ [Emphasis supplied] [Col. 3, lines 31 to 48].

The entire focus of Niwa, regard the notch, is for the notch to be below the lower of the two line of perforations.

The Office Action stated that Olivieri et al. teaches that the notch is situated between the two lines of perforations (Figure 8a, number 431) for the purpose of tearing the materials forming the pack (col. 8, lines 57 and 58). All of the disclosure of Olivieri et al. has to be considered under Section 103(a). The Examiner has not factually shown in the record why any disclosure of Olivieri et al. would be excluded in the search for applicants’ claimed invention.

The C.A.F.C. in *Smithkline Diagnostics, Inc. v. Helena Laboratories Corp.*, 8 USPQ2d 1468, (1988), stated:

“Helena cannot pick and choose among the individual elements of assorted prior art references to recreate the claimed invention. See, e.g., *Azko N.V. v. United States Int’l Trade Comm’n*, 808 F.2d 1471, 1481, 1 USPQ2d 1241, 1246, (Fed. Cir. 1986), *cert. denied*, 107 S.Ct. 2490 (1987). Helena has the burden to show some teaching or suggestion in the reference to support their use in the particular claimed combination.”

Uniroyal Inc, 837 F2d at 1051, 5 USPQ2d at 1438-39. A holding that combination claims are invalid based merely upon finding similar elements of separate prior art patents would be 'contrary to statute and would defeat the congressional purpose in enacting Title 35.' *Panduit Corp.*, 810 F. 2d at 1577, 1 USPQ2d at 1605". [Page 1475] [Emphasis disclosed]

Olivieri et al. only discloses forming perforations in a lower plastic layer (or lower plastic layers) of an already formed multilayer film after the multilayer film has been formed. Therefore, Olivier et al. directs away from applicants' claimed invention.

Furthermore, the combination of Niwa and Olivier et al. would result in the cutting of lines of perforations in a lower plastic layer(s) of an already formed multilayer film. The Examiner has not provided any reasons or facts in the record why one ordinarily skilled in the art in search for applicants' claimed invention, would ignore the subject limitation / feature that is a core part of the Olivieri et al. invention.

Olivieri et al. states:

"Method for the manufacture of a pack, particularly intended for undergoing preservation treatment, from at least one film (10), comprising the two plastic layers, an upper (11) and a lower (12), which from the outer and inner faces of the said pack, and a light-metal central layer (13) sandwiched between the said upper (11) an lower (12) layers, characterized in that, prior to the operations to make the said pack, a laser beam is applied solely to the lower layer (12) of the said film (10), the said

lower layer forming the inner face of the said pack, in order to produce, virtually in the entire thickness of the said lower layer (12), at least one perforation (14) forming at least one precut line.” [Emphasis supplied] [Claim 1, lines 1 to 13].

All of the teaching/disclosures of a prior art rejection references must be considered and cannot be ignored without compelling facts and/or reasons in the record. There are no such compelling facts and/or reasons in the record.

Since Olivieri et al. cuts a lower layer after the multi-layer film has been formed, there are conflicting and contradictory teachings in the record. The Examiner has not factually established in the record why one ordinarily skilled in the art would not be drawn to the cutting of a lower layer of the multi-layer film, which makes applicants’ claimed invention unobvious.

Page 2100-127 of the M.P.E.P. [Section 2141.03, (Rev. 2, May 2004)] states:

“PRIOR ART MUST BE CONSIDERED IN IT ENTIRETY, INCLUDING DISCLOSURES THAT TEACH AWAY FROM THE CLAIMS”

“A prior art reference must be considered in its entirety, i.e., as a whole, including portions that would lead away from the claimed invention. *W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 851 (1984)....”

Schlaeppli et al. (European Published Patent Application 0596747) is of record and is even currently used in another rejection in the Office Action.

The invention of Schlaeppi et al. does not include or use a notch. In fact, Schlaeppi et al. teaches away from the use of a notch because of problems associated with the use of notches. Schlaeppi et al. set out, in its prior art section, the problem with the prior art use of notches which Schlaeppi et al. sought to avoid by its invention. In view of the negative teaching of Schlaeppi, et al. one ordinarily skilled in the art would avoid the use of a notch in the search for applicants' claimed invention.

The Office Action stated that, therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time applicant's invention was made to provide Niwa with the notch that is situated between the two lines of perforations in order to tear the materials forming the pack (col. 8, lines 57 and 58) as taught by Olivieri et al. Applicants traverse this statement as being mere forbidden hindsight. The Examiner has not factually provided in the record the motivation to combine Niwa and Olivieri et al. If such references are combined, the result is not applicants' claimed invention. Schlaeppi et al. directs away from the use of a notch.

This rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 20 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Niwa (European Published Patent Application 0468619) in view of Schlaeppi et al. (European Published Patent Application 0596747). Applicants traverse this rejection.

The Office Action stated that Niwa discloses the process for preparing a multilayer packaging film for a packaging as described above; that Niwa fail to

disclose wherein the precut plastic layer is joined to the at least one other layer by means of extrusion to make up the multi-layered film; and that Schlaeppi et al. teaches that it is well known in the art to secure the other layer to the inner layer by an adhesive or by other lamination or extrusion coating techniques (col. 4, lines 19 to 21). The combination of Niwa and Schlaeppi et al. does not result in applicants' claimed invention.

The Schlaeppi et al. invention did not use a notch and directed away from the use of a notch. Schlaeppi et al. set out, in its prior art section, the prior art problems that the Schlaeppi et al. invention was made to avoid and/or overcome. Schlaeppi et al. clearly directs one ordinarily skilled in the art away from the use of a notch and the problems that it attributes to notches.

Therefore, the combination of Niwa and Schlaeppi et al. would be the absence of a notch. The Examiner has not factually in the record why one ordinarily skilled in the art would ignore the negative teaching of Schlaeppi et al. All of the present claims require a notch.

It is impermissible within the framework of Section 103(a) to pick and choose from any one reference only so much of it as will support a given position, to the exclusion of other parts necessary to the full appreciation of what such reference fairly suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art. In re Wesslau, 147 USPQ 391, 393, (C.C.P.A. 1965).

The Office Action stated that, therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time applicants' invention was made to provide Niwa with the precut plastic layer that is joined to the at least one other

layer by means of extrusion to make up the multi-layered film as it is notoriously well known in the art to secure the other layer to the inner layer by an adhesive or by other lamination or extrusion coating techniques (col. 4, lines 19 to 21) as taught by Schlaeppi. Applicants traverse this statement as being forbidden hindsight. Schlaeppi et al. teaches not to use a notch. The result of the combination of Niwa and Schlaeppi et al. is not applicants' claimed invention.

Olivieri et al. is of record and is even currently used in another rejection in the Office Action.

Olivieri et al. discloses cutting the line(s) of perforations in the inner layer of the already formed multi-layer film. This directs one ordinarily skilled in the art away from applicants' claimed invention.

This rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 27 is drawn to the production of pouch packages that have at least one line of perforations on both sides thereof. Applicants use their multi-layer film to prepare both sides of their pouch packages. See page 3, lines 1 to 3, and page 3, line 32, to page 4, line 4. Niwa only uses lines of perforation on one side of its pouch. See column 3, lines 12 to 18.

Claim 49 is Claim 27 with the requirement that the inner faces of the two sides of the pouch have the line(s) of perforations. Page 3, lines 1 to 3, states:

"In the case of packaging made from the packaging film e.g. a pouch-type form of packaging, the film with the perforations in it is preferably situated on the inside of the packaging."

Niwa does not disclose use of line(s) of perforations on the inner side of the pouch. See Figure 3, and column 3, line 58, to column 4, line 16.

Reconsideration, reexamination and allowance of the claims is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

June 21, 2006
Date

Virgil H. Marsh
Virgil H. Marsh
Reg. No. 23,083

Fisher, Christen & Sabol
1725 K St., NW
Suite 1108
Washington, DC 20006
Tel.: 202-659-2000
Fax: 202-659-2015

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence of is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on June 21, 2006.

Christen Stepien
FISHER, CHRISTEN & SABOL
1725 Street, N.W., Suite 1108
Washington, D.C. 20006